

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 1-8 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Son et al. (US 6,282,161) (hereinafter "Son").

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son in view of Nishiwaki (US 6,704,254) (hereinafter "Nishiwaki").

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8

Independent claims 1 and 7 recite: "...searching a memory in the disc drive for a tilt angle for a recording or reproducing sector of the disc in which the tilt is detected...." In the Office Action, in the Response to Remarks section on page 2 at numbered paragraph 1, the Examiner notes that the prior art of Son teaches a tilt adjusting means where optimum tilt adjusting values are stored in the memory and further cites Figures 2 and 7 and steps S712-S716 of Son. However, it is respectfully submitted that optimum tilting adjusting values *for a recording or reproducing sector* are not searched for in the memory of Son. Instead, as is clearly discussed in Son in column 7, lines 26-30: "the tilt control value is calculated at the recording position by interpolation with reference to the outputs S_inrec and S_outrec stored in the memory 38 during recording of the disk (step 714)." Every time a tilt control value is needed in the method of Son, an interpolation with reference to the outputs S_inrec and S_outrec stored in the memory must be performed. The memory of Son only stores outputs S_inrec and S_outrec so that the interpolation may be performed. By contrast, according to the method of claims 1 and 7, each recording or reproducing sector of the disc becomes a sector in which a tilt is only corrected one time. As such, the tilt angle does not need to be repeatedly calculated as in Son.

Further, in regards to claim 7, this deficiency in Son is not cured by Nishiwaki, which was relied upon to show an optical disk control method encoded in a computer readable medium.

Claims 2 and 8 depend on claims 1 and 7, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 3 and 4

Claim 3 recites: "...a controller that, if the tilt of the disc is detected, searches the memory for the tilt angle for the recording or reproducing sector of the disc wherein the pickup is currently positioned, and controls driving of the motor using the searched tilt angle." In the Office Action, in the Response to Remarks section, the Examiner notes that Son's tilt control value is calculated at the recording position by interpolation. However, it is respectfully submitted that this discussion in Son does not anticipate the technical feature of claim 3 of searching the memory for the tilt angle for the recording or reproducing sector of the disc. The memory of Son only stores outputs S_inrec and S_outrec so that the interpolation may be performed. By contrast, according to the apparatus of claim 3, each recording or reproducing sector of the disc becomes a sector in which a tilt is only corrected one time. As such, the tilt angle does not need to be repeatedly calculated as in Son.

Claim 4 depends on claim 3 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 5 and 6

Independent claim 5 recites: "...a controller that detects the position information of the pickup based on the number of pulses for driving a second motor in the pickup moving unit and stores the position information in the memory, and if the tilt of the disc is detected by the tilt detector, searches the memory for a tilt angle for a sector of the disc from which the tilt is detected and controls driving of the first motor using the searched tilt angle." In the Office Action, the rejection of claim 5 was made on the same grounds as the rejection of claim 3. Similarly, the traversal of the rejection is comparable. In contrast to claim 5, the memory of Son only stores outputs S_inrec and S_outrec so that the interpolation may be performed. By contrast, according to the apparatus of claim 5, each recording or reproducing sector of the disc becomes a sector in which a tilt is only corrected one time. As such, the tilt angle does not need to be repeatedly calculated as in Son.

Claim 6 depends on claim 5 and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Feb 21, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501